





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,523	10/25/2001	Alan R. Cohn	LIUI117961	3906
26389 7	590 04/30/2002			
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC	EXAMINER			
1420 FIFTH A SUITE 2800	VENUE		BRATLIE, STEVEN A	
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347				
. ,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3652	
		DATE MAILED: 04/30/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	. 6
Office Action Summary	BRAIL	Applicant(s) COHN, eta Group Art Unit 3652	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence	address
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SOF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by containing the set or extended period for reply will, the status. Responsive to communication(s) filed on	CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, a reply within the statutory minitefault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to	rer, may a reply be timely filed after to mum of thirty (30) days will be cons om the mailing date of this communi to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C.	dered timely. cation . § 133).
 ☐ This action is FINAL. ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance of accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quay. 	except for formal matters, project 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 2	osecution as to the merits is 213.	closed in
Disposition of Claims Claim(s)/_ 2 3	•	is/are pending in the	application.
Claim(s) 2 3 Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn fro	m consideration.
Of the above claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		is/are rejected.	
Mclaim(s) 1-23		is/are objected to.	
Claim(s)			ction or election
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Paten ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/a ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/a ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	t Drawing Review, PTO-948 is □ approvare objected to by the Examin	red □ disapproved.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All Some* None of the CERTIFIED received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Se	rial Number) om the International Bureau (
*Certified copies not received:			
Attachment(s) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-144 Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review	9, Paper No(s)	☐ Other	Application, PTO-
	Office Action Summa	·,	

Application/Control Number: 10/047,523

Art Unit: 3652

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: 1. "second plate 32b", "second plate 34b".

Appropriate correction is required.

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for 2. all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
 - The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 3. 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - Determining the scope and contents of the prior art. 1.
 - Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. 2.
 - Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. 3.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating 4. obviousness or nonobviousness.
 - Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable · 4. over Nilson in view of Fretwell et al, Corley, Jr. and Japanese Patent #457685. Nilson discloses a substantially similar lift system including parallel arms #24, #29 and support member #32. It is noted that using the lift for a wheelchair is merely intended use and does structural define over the art (In re Sinex 135 USPQ 302; In re Pearson 181 USPQ 641). Fretwell et al discloses the use of a similar lift for a wheelchair. Nilson

Application/Control Number: 10/047,523

Art Unit: 3652

lacks an u-shaped bracket support. Corley, Jr. discloses an u-shaped bracket #35, #36 at the end of the parallel arms. It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute such a bracket if so desired. The motivation is the known use of equivalents. Japanese Patent #457685 discloses the use of an u-shaped bracket 43a, 43b between the ends of the parallel link (claim 10).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Bratlie whose telephone number is (703) 308-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00. Friday is the examiner's day off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177.

Bratlie/dw

April 24, 2002

Steven a. Bratlie

STEVEN A. BRATLIE PRIMARY EXAMINER